



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/482,135 01/12/00 REGNIER

K 99-247US

MM92/0705

Charles S Cohen  
Patent Counsel  
Molex Incorporated  
2222 Wellington Court  
Lisle IL 60532

PRASAD, C

2839

EXAMINER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED:

07/05/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/482,135

Applicant(s)

REGNIER, KENT E

Examiner

Chandrika Prasad

Art Unit

2839

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on th cov r sh t with the correspond nce address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 28-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

**Attachment(s)**

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

**Response to Amendment**

1. The reply filed on 5/24/01 consists of amendments to claim 9 and remarks related to rejection of claims. The claims are not allowable as explained below.

**Drawings**

2. The drawings are objected to because the hatch lines in Figures 1 and 3 for the housing 22 is not indicative of an insulating material. Correction is required.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 11-20, 22, 23, 25 and 26 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bourdon et al.

Bourdon (Figures 1-10) shows an electrical connector 1 having a housing 90 with a plurality of cylindrical receptacles, a plurality of cylindrical contact members 20 received in the bores of the receptacle and a plurality of resilient retainers (seals) 30, 40 to provide an ungapped (sealed) connection between the contact members and the receptacles at the location of the retainer. The seals have openings, which fit over the contact. Each receptacle provides a stop surface in the axial direction, and the inside cylindrical surface of the receptacles provide a stop in the radial direction. The retainers abut against these stop surfaces. The contact has two portions on two sides of the retainer, which are within the housing.

Application/Control Number: 09/482,135  
Art Unit: 2839

But Bourdon does not show a dielectric housing and the contacts arranged in a 1 mm or 0.05 inch grid. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to make the housing 90 of a dielectric material because it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

As to the claims 7 and 8, the instant invention does not provide any reasons or problems to be solved by arranging the contacts in a 1 mm or 0.05 inch grid. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to arrange the contacts in a 1 mm or 0.05 inch grid because this would provide a closely spaced or dense array of contacts.

As to the claim 12, Bourdon does not show the housing made of a plurality of strips. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to make the housing in several parts in the form of strips because it has been held that constructing a formerly integral part in various elements involves only routine skill in the art. Nerwin v. Erlichman, 168 USPQ 177, 179.

5. Claims 5, 9, 10, 21, 24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bourdon et al.

Bourdon shows all the features of these claims as described in Paragraph 4 above except a land at one (mating) end of the contact member and the terminal end being bent to be offset from the axis of the mating end. Official Notice is hereby given that such features of a contact member are well known in the art of electrical connectors. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide these features to the Bourdon contact member because a land (pad) will provide a larger

Art Unit: 2839

contact area and the bent terminal end would provide a means to connect to other parts which are offset from the axial direction of the mating end.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Bourdon clearly shows a resilient seal (retainer) used between a contact member and a housing in order to prevent any unwanted material getting into the contact portion.

***Contact Information***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad whose telephone number is (703) 308-0977.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus, can be reached at (703) 308-3119. The fax number for this Group is (703) 308-7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or processing should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.



Chandrika Prasad

June 12, 2001



TULSIDAS PATEL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER